NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

THE OXFORD MANUSCRIPT OF IBN TAYMIYYA'S ANTI-CHRISTIAN POLEMICS

According to Brockelmann (*Supplement*, II, 123, nos. 72, 73), Ibn Taymiyya wrote, apart from some shorter treatises, two major anti-Christian polemical works: *Takhjīl ahl al-injīl wa'l-nahj al-ṣaḥīḥ fi'l-radd 'alā man baddal dīn 'Īsā b. Maryam al-Masīḥ* (no. 72), a copy of which is said to be preserved in Oxford (II, 45); and *al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ li-man baddal dīn al-Masīḥ* (no. 73), a copy of which is reported as being contained in the same Oxford MS, as well as in a number of other MSS and in two Cairo editions. (I have at my disposal the edition Cairo, 1323/1905.)

An examination of the Oxford MS (Marsh 299) shows that this account of its contents is not correct. The manuscript does not in fact contain two works, and the error seems to be entirely Brockelmann's, for A. Nicoll, in his description of the MS (Catalogue, vol. II, no. 45, pp. 74–5 and additions, p. 510) says that the MS contains *Takhjīl ahl al-injīl* . . . and says nothing about a second work.[1] On the other hand, a comparison shows that the contents of the MS are in fact identical with the last quarter of *al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ*, corresponding to the portion from vol. III, p. 258, to the end of the book (vol. IV, p. 324) in the printed edition. It has, however, a title-page and a short introduction, in which the MS is given as a different work by Ibn Taymiyya.

Fol. 1 is not an authentic part of the MS: the paper and handwriting are both quite different from those of the subsequent folios. The recto bears the following title:

كتاب تخجيل اهل الانجيل
والنهج الصحيح فى الردّ على
من بدّل دين عيسى ابن مريم المسيح
تاليف شيخ الاسلام ابى العباس
تقىّ الدين بن احمد[2]
ابن تيميّة الحرّانى
رضى الله عنه
آمن

[1] Nicoll knew the title (*Bayān*) *al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ* etc. only from Ḥājjī Khalīfa; he noticed its similarity to the title as given in the Oxford MS and suggested that the two titles may refer to the same work. The note in the Leiden Catalogue by de Jong and de Goeje (IV, p. 251): 'The Bodleian MS Nic. 45 contains another, but this time complete, copy of the same work [*al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ*]' is erroneous and is possibly based on the remark of Nicoll just referred to.

[2] Ibn Taymiyya's name is Abu'l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Ḥalīm . . . b. Muḥammad; the form given in the title is erroneous.

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

The verso begins as follows : بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم الحمد لله الذى شرع لنا الدين، والصلوة والسلام على افضل من اعتصم بحبله المتين، سيّدنا ومولانا محمد عبده ونبّيه ورسوله الامين، صلى الله عليه وعلى آله وصحبه الرحماء فيما بينهم الاشدّاء على الكافرين، صلوة دائمة متعاقبة فى كل وقت وحين، وسلّم تسليما كثيرا الى يوم الدين. اما بعد فيقول العبد المتمسّك بذيل الالطاف الخفيّه، ابو العباس احمد بن تيميه، الحنبلىّ، عامله المولى بغفران ذنبه الخفىّ والجلىّ، هذا كتاب سمّيته تخجيل، اهل الانجيل، والنهج الصحيح، فى الردّ على من بدّل دين عيسى بن مريم المسيح، اذكر فيه اعلام النبوّات بنصّ الحديث والكتاب الفصيح، فاقول والله الهادى، وعليه توكّلى واعتمادى، واليه ملجأى واستنادى : اعلم وفّقك الله وايانا ان النصارى لهم قول مشهور بينهم وهو ان منهم من يقول ان محمدا صلع لم يبشر به النبوّات الخ.

From here the text of the manuscript goes on as in the printed edition of the *al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ* (III, 258, l. 3 from below and what follows).

The MS ends, like the printed edition (IV, 324) with the words : وهذا مبسوط فى موضع اخر. There follows the colophon in the hand of the scribe ; the words in square brackets are, however, not authentic, but were written by a forger over an erasure : تمت النبوات تصنيف الشيخ | الامام العالم العلامة اوحد العصر | فريد الدهر شيخ الاسلام [ابى عبد | الله احمد بن محمد بن حنبل | الشيبانى] رضى الله عنه وارضاه امين | اعاد الله تعالى | من بركاته.

Originally the colophon no doubt contained the name of the true author, Ibn Taymiyya ; the forger, however, wanted to ascribe the book to the founder of the Ḥanbalī school, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal himself ! His effort was not successful, for someone pasted over the forged name and wrote instead ابن الشيخ ابى عبد الله محمد بن تيمية الحرانى.[1] (Nicoll reproduced this state of the colophon.) On the left side there is a note with the signature of the scribe : Muḥammad b. Yūsuf b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥanbalī al-Maqdisī ; the date is unfortunately illegible. On the right side there is a note in a different hand : هذا اخر الكتاب وهو الرد على النصارى تاليف سيدنا | شيخ الاسلام ابى العباس تقى الدين احمد بن تيمية تغمده الله | [بالرح]مة والرضوان واسلمه فيح الجنان بمنه وكرمه.

One is tempted simply to conclude, in view of the fact that the title-page and the beginning of the text are obviously later substitutes, that a fragmentary copy of *al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ* received a forged title-page and a forged introduction by an owner who wanted to give his property the semblance of a complete work. The problem is, however, more complicated than that. It can be shown that

[1] I do not know why this curious form of the name (referring to Ibn Taymiyya's ancestor Muḥammad ?) was chosen.

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

the volume is not a fragment which owes its present extent to chance. Vol. III, p. 258 is an important turning point in the structure of Ibn Taymiyya's book. As can be seen from the analysis in E. Fritsch, *Islam und Christentum im Mittelalter*, Breslau, 1930, pp. 31–2, up to that point Ibn Taymiyya is refuting paragraph by paragraph the Christian Apology from Cyprus which gave the occasion for the writing of his own work. ' After having dealt with the Apology of Cyprus there follows a discussion of the prophecies in the Old and New Testaments referred to Muḥammad (III, 258 to IV, 38), of the conversions of Christians and Jews in the time of Muḥammad (IV, 39–62), and more especially of the miracles of Muḥammad which prove his prophecy (IV, 62–287) ' (Fritsch). One has therefore the impression that the portion contained in the Oxford MS may have led an independent existence, either as a special part detached from the whole of the book, or more probably as an independent treatise—or even as a preliminary draft, which was subsequently incorporated into the great work of polemics. In this connexion we may recall that the colophon says ' The prophecies are finished ' (*tammat al-nubuwwāt*) ; now this is in itself a very unusual phrase for a colophon, and can hardly be meant as a title, but seems to be somehow connected with the subject of the volume and describes fairly well its contents.[1] Are the title-page and the introduction, though not an original part of the MS in a material sense, then authentic in their contents ? The fact that the colophon does not give the same title as they do, and also the fact that the title *Takhjīl ahl al-injīl* . . . does not seem to figure in the lists of Ibn Taymiyya's works, speak against this. A final decision on the nature of the volume and its relation to the final form of the *al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ* cannot be reached without the examination of the MSS of that work.

The matter is rendered even more complicated by the fact that Ibn Taymiyya is reported by Ḥājjī Khalīfa (Istanbul ed. of 1941, I, 379–80) to have composed a polemical book called *al-Takhjīl li-man baddala'l-Tawrāt wa'l-Injīl*. This title is similar to that given by the Oxford MS, but is not identical ; moreover the incipit given by Ḥājjī Khalīfa : الحمد لله الذى فطرنا على دين الاسلام الخ does not coincide with that of the Oxford MS. If we assume that the title of the Oxford MS is due to a falsification, one could also suggest that the forger concocted his title from a combination of the title of the book seen by Ḥājjī Khalīfa and that of the *al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ* ; but judgment must be reserved.

There is, however, another error to be cleared up in this connexion. Brockelmann states (loc. cit., under no. 72) that Ibn Taymiyya's *Takhjīl ahl al-injīl* has been epitomized by Abu'l-Faḍl al-Su'ūdī under the title of *Mukhtaṣar Takhjīl man ḥarrafa'l-injīl*, and this might be held to authenticate

[1] A book by Ibn Taymiyya bearing the title of *Kitāb al-nubuwwāt* has been published in Cairo in 1346, and registered by Brockelmann, *Supplement*, II, 120, no. 3. (I am much obliged to Professor H. Laoust for lending me his copy.) This book, however, deals with the miracles of the Prophet from an inner Islamic dogmatic point of view, and polemizes against Muslims who hold opinions different from those of the author rather than against the *Ahl al-Kitāb* ; and there is no connexion between it and the present MS.

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

the title in the Oxford MS, were it not that al-Su'ūdī's epitome has in fact nothing to do with Ibn Taymiyya : it is an epitome of a book with a similar title written by Abu'l-Baqā' al-Ja'farī, *Takhjīl man ḥarraf dīn al-injīl*, of which the author himself has written a shorter version under the title of *al-Bayān al-waḍūḥ al-mashhūd min faḍā'iḥ al-Naṣārā wa'l-Yahūd*.[1] The epitome of the *Takhjīl*, by Abu'l-Faḍl al-Su'ūdī, has been printed by F. J. van den Ham.[2]

Finally, whatever we think of the literary character of the Oxford MS, by establishing the fact that it is materially identical with the last part of the *al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ*, we can unravel another bibliographical problem. Ludovico Marracci in his *Prodromus ad refutationem Alcorani* often quotes substantial passages from a work by Ibn Taymiyya (whom he calls ' Ahmedus filius Abdolhalimi ', with variations). He does not give its title, but calls it ' Apology against the Christian religion in favour of the Mohammedan sect ', or usually simply ' Apology '. Nicoll noted in his Catalogue that some of the quotations are to be found in the Oxford MS. What he did not notice, however, is that many quotations do not recur in the Oxford MS, whereas all the quotations are to be found in the *al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ*. Marracci obviously had at his disposal a copy of the *al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ* and the occurrence of some of the quotations in the Oxford MS is of course due to the fact that this is identical with the last part of the *al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ*. C. A. Nallino, in his study of Marracci's sources (' Le fonti arabe manoscritte dell'opera di Ludovico Marracci sul Corano ', *Rendiconti R. Accademia dei Lincei*, 1931, 303–49 = *Raccolta di scritti*, II, 90–134) writes as follows (p. 332 = *Raccolta*, p. 118) : ' As regards the work so keenly opposed by Marracci, Alexander Nicoll, on p. 510 of the 2nd part (Oxford, 1821) of vol. I of the *Bibl. Bodleianae cod. mss. orient, Catalogus*, bears witness that it is the still unpublished *Takhjīl ahl al-injīl*, " The shaming of the followers of the Gospel " (who are accused of having changed Christ's true religion), a great part of which has passed into the *Prodromus* of Marracci, the first European scholar to turn his attention to the work of Ibn Taymiyya '. With his usual perspicacity, Nallino felt that something was not in order and added in a footnote : ' Nicoll also had at his disposal in Oxford a MS of another analogous book by Ibn Taymiyya bearing the title *al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ li-man baddal dīn al-Masīḥ* (subsequently published in Cairo 1323 Hij., A.D. 1905) and of which there is a good résumé by Mons. Ignazio Di Matteo, *Ibn Taymiyyah*

[1] See Ḥājjī Khalīfa, I, 379, immediately preceding the article about Ibn Taymiyya's *Takhjīl* (see above) ; Brockelmann, I, 553, *Suppl.*, I, 766 (where Abu'l-Faḍl [read so for Abu'l-Fidā'] al-Su'ūdī's epitome is again registered, this time in the correct context [though it is not made clear that it is an epitome of the *Takhjīl*, not of the *al-Bayān al-waḍūḥ*]) ; E. Fritsch, *Islam und Christentum im Mittelalter*, Breslau, 1930, 17. According to M. Steinschneider, *Polemische und apologetische Literatur in arabischer Sprache*, 36, the MS Atif Efendi 5 contains the *Takhjīl*, according to Brockelmann the *al-Bayān al-waḍūḥ*. Al-Ṣafī b. al-'Assal's [d. before 1260] *Nahj al-sabīl* is (of course) not a refutation of ' Ibn Taymiyya's [born 1263] *Takhjīl ahl al-injīl* ' (L. Cheikho, *al-Makhṭūṭāt al-'arabiyya li-katabat al-naṣrāniyya*, Beirut, 1924, p. 12, quoted by Fritsch, p. 25), but of Abu'l-Baqā's *Takhjīl*, as it is correctly stated in G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, II, 389.

[2] *Disputatio pro religione Muhammedanorum adversus Christianos*, Leiden, 1877–90.

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

o riassunto della su opera . . ., Palermo, 1912, in 16°. I stress this, because without the testimony of Nicoll one could think of the *al-Jawāb*, in which many of the passages quoted by Marracci also recur textually'. As a matter of fact, Nicoll had at his disposal only Marsh 299—the idea that he had access also to the *al-Jawāb*, and that his assertion that Marracci's quotations recur in Marsh 299 implies that Marsh 299 agrees better with Marracci's text than the *al-Jawāb*, is based on the wrong assumption (probably derived from Brockelmann) that Marsh 299 also contains the *al-Jawāb*.[1] As we have already seen that this is not so, there is therefore no longer anything to prevent us from concluding that Marracci's quotations are from the *al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ*.

S. M. STERN

A SIXTEENTH-CENTURY REFERENCE TO SHAḤRĪ DIALECT AT ẒUFĀR

The extract forming the subject of this note is taken from vol. III of the unabridged *Fatāwā* of 'Abdullāh b. 'Afīf al-Dīn 'Abdullāh b. Aḥmad b. 'Alī b. Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm Makhramah al-Saibānī al-Djūhī [2] which was inspected in 1954 by courtesy of its owner the Ḳāḍī of Dathīnah. The Ḳāḍī possesses only this volume, and the existence of a complete set has not yet been reported. This is the more to be regretted in that vol. III is a work of interest and importance. The usual epitome of the *Fatāwā Bā Makhramah* commonly found in Ḥaḍramawt is now available at the Library of the School in photographic form, the original being in the Sulṭān's Library in al-Mukallā. It is probable that copies of this latter recension are common throughout all the Shāfi'ī centres of Southern Arabia. A search throughout its pages has not, however, revealed any allusion to the *fatwā* in which the passage *infra* figures, though cases of contracts by foreigners in Arabic are discussed at length from many Shāfi'ī sources (fols. 232a–233a).

According to biographical details supplied by the compiler of the epitome, the author was born at al-Shiḥr in 907 H. (A.D. 1501–2) where he twice held the office of Ḳāḍī, in 943 H. (A.D. 1536–7), and in 945 H. (A.D. 1538–9). He later went to Aden where he died in 972 H. (A.D. 1564–5). It is reasonable to suppose that the case in question was referred to him from Ẓufār while he was Ḳāḍī at al-Shiḥr. Both of these ports were controlled by the Kathīrī Sulṭāns, brothers, though they were not usually on good terms with each other. Connexions between Ẓufār and al-Shiḥr have always been close.

The legal point at issue relates to the formula of divorce, and it might be compared with a question sent from Malabar to Ibn Ḥadjar al-Haitamī [3]

[1] See above, p. 124, and n. 1.

[2] The size of the full collection may be imagined when it is realized that vol. III contains no less than 1,029 pages. There were two collections of Bā Makhramah's *Fatāwā* both of which were utilized in the epitome; I do not know to which this volume belongs.

[3] *Al-Fatāwā al-kubrā al-fiḳhīyah*, Cairo, 1938, IV, 129.

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

for his opinion ; there, an Arabic formula of divorce was apparently incorrectly used to establish a separation, and the question arose as to whether the pronunciation of such a formula with a different intention was held to form a valid divorce. It is a pity I did not record Bā Makhramah's answer, but with a wealth of material to scrutinize in so short a time, one sometimes omits material which later proves interesting.

The passage runs as follows :

مسالة من الجعفرى قاضى ظفار . . . باديه يقال لهم السحرا لهم لغة كالعجم وليس هم عجم ومع ذلك يقدرون اكثرهم على العربية ولكنهم اذا ارادوا الطلاق لا يطلقون الا بلغتهم فاذا اراد احدهم ان يطلق مجانا قال ثثى مشخلوت طيت وان اراد الثلاث قال ثثى مشخلوت ثثيت وان اراد طلقتين قال ثريت واذا اراد خطابها وهى حاضره بمعنى انت قال هيت واذا علق على اعطا شى وهى غايبه بمعنى هى قال سه فقوله ثثى اى امراتى ، ومشخلوت اى طالق ، وطيت اى واحده وثثيت اى الثلاث وثريت اى ثنتين وهيت اى انت وسه اى هى.

' A question from al-Djaʿfarī, Ḳāḍī of Ẓufār . . . " Bedouin called al-Shaḥrā who have a language like the Africans,[1] but they are not Africans, and, notwithstanding, most of them can cope with Arabic. However, when they wish to (pronounce a) divorce, they only (pronounce a) divorce in their own language. When one of them wishes to divorce without compensation [2] he says, ' *Ṯíṯi mešḥalót ṭit* '. If he wishes the triple (divorce) he says, ' *Ṯíṯi mešḥalót ṭaṭét* '. If he wishes (to pronounce) a double divorce he says, ' *Ṯirít* '. When he wishes to address her, she being present, with the sense of ' you (f.) ', he says, ' *hit* '. When he adds by way of giving something,[3] she being absent, with the sense of ' she ', he says, ' *se* '. His saying ' *ṯíṯi* ', means ' my wife ', and ' *mešḥalót* ' means ' divorced ', and ' *tit* ' means ' once ', and ' *ṭaṭét* ' means ' with the triple (divorce) ', and ' *ṯirít* ' means ' double (divorce) ' ; ' *hit* ' means ' you (f.) ', and ' *se* ' means ' she ' ".'

At the present day the formula for divorce as used by ordinary people in Aden is : فلانه بنت فلان مُطَلّقه بالثلاث بطلاق خلوع ما فيه بُه رُجوع

In Ḥaḍramī colloquial Arabic the variant form of the latter part of the above phrase is : طلاق خُلْعى ما له رُجْعِى

In historical and other MSS the Shaḥrā tribe is mentioned from time to time. For example, in the Chronicle of Shanbal, under the events of the year

[1] The term Barr al-ʿAdjam is applied to the African littoral of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden by the South Arabians, probably applying more particularly to Somaliland. In view of the connexion between the Semitic languages of parts of that area and the Mahrah group of dialects, the author's observation is most pertinent.

[2] The use of ' *maḏjḏjān-an* ' is a little strange here, unless it be a technical term of which we are ignorant.

[3] Adenese Arabs when asked their opinion on the sense of this phrase, suggested that it referred to the dowry, no doubt that part of it known as *muʾaḵhḵhar*.

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

834 H. (A.D. 1430–1), there is an allusion to al-Ḳarā and al-Shaḥrā near Ẓufār, and they may even be mentioned before this date. Al-Saḥrā is written in the MS but no great significance need be attached to this as South Arabian MSS are prone to omit diacritics where names are considered well known. It is believed that this tribe gave its name to al-Shiḥr (which has in fact another name also), and a medieval geography [1] states that 'its inhabitants were a generation of the Mahrah called al-Shaḥrāt'. A Mahrī to-day described both the Ḳarā and Shaḥrā tribes as being of Bin Taimūr, and stated that al-Shaḥrī was *ḍa'īf* which would imply that it was inferior in some respects.[2]

A plural of al-Shiḥr is sometimes used as a variant, al-Ashḥār. If it be true that the Shaḥrā did live in al-Shiḥr, then this must have been before Islām, but there are actually numbers of Mahrah living in al-Shiḥr to this day.

R. B. SERJEANT

Die älteste Aufzeichnung über die Šaḥrī-Sprache [3] war bisher die 'Note sur la langue hhymiarite' des französischen Konsuls Fulgence Fresnel,[4] die er am 12. Dezember 1837 aus Ǧidda an J. Mohl schickte. Er bringt einige Paradigmata zum Verb der von ihm Eḥkili [5] genannten Sprache, einige Wörter und eine Übersetzung von Genesis xxxvii, 2. Dieses geringe Material ist insofern besonders interessant, als es ähnlich dem Soqoṭri am Verb einen voll ausgebildeten Dual aufweist, der 60 Jahre später, als David Heinrich Müller seine Texte aufnahm, bis auf wenige Reste verschwunden war.[6] Schon für diesen kurzen Zeitraum können wir also einen Wandel in der Sprache feststellen.

Die oben mitgeteilte Stelle führt uns nun gleich drei Jahrhunderte weiter zurück und darf trotz der Dürftigkeit ihres Materials als die weitaus älteste Quelle für das Šaḥrī und die neusüdarabischen Sprachen überhaupt unser Interesse beanspruchen.

Im einzelnen ist zur Erklärung der Wörter folgendes zu bemerken:

(1) *ṯiṯi* enthält *ṯiṯ* 'Frau', heute *tiṯ*. Bittner,[7] I, § 24 erklärt das Wort als Metathese von **ṯit* < **ṯṯit* < **(e)nṯít* mit Assimilation des *n* an das *ṯ*. Das

[1] *K. al-Nisbah ila 'l-mawāḍi' wa-'l-buldān.* See R. B. Serjeant, 'Two sixteenth-century Arabian geographical works', *BSOAS*, XXI, 2, 1958, 269.

[2] Dr. Wagner points out that D. H. Müller, *Die Mehri- und Soqoṭri-Sprache*, III, Wien, 1907, 120) states, 'Es gibt zwei Arten von Bergbewohnern: die Śḥari (die Schwachen), welche Klienten der Stämme zu sein scheinen, und Qabîli, welche also dem Stamm selbst angehören. Hier habe ich folgende Glosse: Be-erḍen Qúliy be-Śḥari (so mit ḥ nicht mit ḫ !) = qeraúvi (arab.)'.

[3] Zu dieser gegenüber dem bisher üblichen Šḫauri richtigeren Bezeichnung der Sprache vgl. Charles D. Matthews, *Non-Arabic place names in central South Arabia.* Maschinenschriftlich vervielfältigter Auszug seines auf dem 24. Internationalen Orientalistenkongress in München 1957 gehaltenen Vortrages.

[4] *Journal Asiatique*, Sér. 3, Tom. VI, 1838, 79–84.

[5] Vgl. die heute übliche arabische Form al-Ḥaklī.

[6] Vgl. Ewald Wagner, 'Die erste Person Dualis im Semitischen', *ZDMG*, CII, 1952, 229–33.

[7] Mit Bittner ist im folgenden auf Maximilian Bittner, *Studien zur Šḥauri-Sprache in den Bergen von Ḍofâr und am Persischen Meerbusen*, I–IV (Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philos.-hist. Kl., Bd. CLXXIX, Abh. 2, 4, 5; Bd. CLXXXIII, Abh. 5), Wien, 1915–17, verwiesen.

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

Wort gehört also zu sem. *'nṯ*. Die vorliegende alte Form zeigt, dass die Laute nicht plötzlich umgesprungen sind, sondern zuerst eine progressive Assimilation stattfand und dann eine Dissimilation. *-i* ist das Possessivsuffix der 1. Person sing. Eine Tonverschiebung hat sein Antritt nicht zur Folge, vgl. Bittner, II, § 20–1.

(2) *mešḫalót* ist fem. sing. des Partizips des Kausativ-Reflexivstammes (= arab. X) von *ḫly*. Im Šaḥrī ist von diesen Radikalen bisher nur der Steigerungs-Einwirkungsstamm (= arab. II) *ḫúli* in der transitiven Bedeutung ' (eine Frau) entlassen ' belegt, vgl. Bittner, II, § 17. Im Mehrī bedeutet der Steigerungsstamm *ḫôlī* ebenfalls ' (eine Frau) entlassen ', vgl. Bittner, *Mehri-Studien*,[1] II, § 103. Doch findet sich hier auch der Kausativ-Reflexivstamm *šḫaliyôt* in der Bedeutung ' sie ging vom Manne weg ' mit dem Futurpartizip *mešḫaliyête*, vgl. Bittner, *Mehri-Studien*, II, § 106b. In unserem Falle muss die Bedeutung ' entlassen sein ' sein. Das Šaḥrī das das Futurpartizip des Mehrī nicht kennt, verwendet heute auch die anderen Partizipien nur noch sehr selten, meist in substantivierter Bedeutung. Vielleicht war zur Zeit unseres Textes das Partizipium noch lebendiger. Ausserdem handelt es sich um eine stehende Formel, die durchaus noch bedeutend älter sein kann. Da Partizipien heute sehr selten sind, nimmt es nicht Wunder, dass Bittner, II, § 6 für den Reflexiv-Kausativstamm keinen Beleg angibt. Doch finden wir ein erstarrtes Partizip dieses Stammes in *eñšáġer*, fem. *eñšġarót* ' ein anderer ', vgl. Bittner, II, § 31 (Radikale *ġyr*). Wenn in unserem Falle auch kein Verb II *y* sondern III *y* vorliegt, so wird man doch nach dem Vorbild von *eñšġarót* und dem oben genannten Futurpartizip *mešḫaliyête* des Mehrī *mešḫalót* vokalisieren dürfen, obwohl nach dem Vorbild des Imperfekts des Kausativ-Reflexivstammes im Šaḥrī auch *mešaḫlót* in Frage käme. Die stets betonte Femininendung *-ót* ist gerade bei Partizipien besonders häufig, vgl. Bittner, II, § 42, Anm. 3. Anstelle des anlautenden *me-* hätte man im heutigen Šaḥrī eher *eñ-* erwartet, da heutzutage *m* + Vokal zumeist umspringen und *m* dann vor dem folgenden Konsonanten nasaliert wird, vgl. Bittner, I, § 9 und § 37b. Da jedoch auch heute noch unnasalierte Formen vorkommen, wäre es zuviel gesagt, wenn man behauptete, dass das *Fatwā* eine ältere Form bewahrt hätte, die die Nasalierung noch nicht kannte.[2]

[1] Hiermit ist im folgenden auf Maximilian Bittner, *Studien zur Laut- und Formenlehre der Mehri-Sprache in Südarabien*, I–V, I–III (Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philos.-hist. Kl., Bd. CLXII, Abh. 5 ; CLXVIII, 2 ; CLXXII, 5 ; CLXXIV, 4 ; CLXXVI, 1 ; CLXXVIII, 2, 3), Wien, 1909–15, verwiesen.

[2] Noch weiter fortgeschritten war diese Entwicklung dagegen bereits 1840 in dem Dialekt des Šaḥrī, der Sprache der Insel Curia Muria, von dem J. G. Hulton in seiner ' Notice on the Curia Muria Island ', *Transactions of the Bombay Geographical Society*, III, 1840, 183–97, 103 Wörter aufzeichnete. Hier ist die Nasalierung bereits wieder aufgegeben, so dass das *m* völlig geschwunden ist, vgl. Wolf Leslau, ' The position of the dialect of Curia Muria in modern South Arabic ', *BSOAS*, XII, 1, 1947, 17, Conclusion § 5. Aus der gleichen Zeit finden wir freilich in den Šaḥrī-Aufzeichnungen von L. Krapf, die G. H. A. v. Ewald in seinem Artikel ' Ueber die himjarische Sprache ', *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft der Sprache*, Bd. I, 1846, 311–15 veröffentlichte (das Šaḥrī wird dort Sprache von Murbat dafar genannt) noch völlig unnasalisiertes *magrub* ' Abend ' gegenüber dem gleichen Wort *eñġréb* ' Westen ' bei Bittner, I, § 37c.

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

(3) *ṭit* ist das Femininum zu *ṭad* ' eins ', vgl. Bittner, II, § 32, und zur Etymologie auch Bittner, *Mehri-Studien*, III, § 70.

(4) *ṯaṯét* ' drei ' ist die maskuline Form des Zahlworts < **ṯalṯét*, vgl. Bittner, II, § 32.

(5) *ṯirít* (oder *ṯrit*) [1] ist das Femininum von *ṯro* ' zwei ', vgl. Bittner, II, § 32 und zur Etymologie auch Bittner, *Mehri-Studien*, III, § 71.

Seltsam ist der Wechsel des Genus beim Zahlwort. Aber man muss ja wohl ein Wort wie ' Entlassung ' oder ' Mal ' ergänzen. Vielleicht ist hierbei einmal an ein maskulines und einmal an ein feminines Wort gedacht. Oder *ṯaṯét* ist ein Fehler für die feminine Form *ṯleṯ* (wie im Arab. ohne Femininendung). Auch sonst finden wir in der Konstruktion der Zahlwörter im Šaḥrī gelegentlich einige Verwirrung. So steht z. B. bei Müller kurz hintereinander *'aśéret šet derêhim*, *'eśrét šitét derêhim*, und *'áśer šet derêhim* ' 16 *Dirham* ' [2]. Ein ähnlicher Fehler kommt auch im Soqoṭri einmal vor.[3]

(6) *hit* ' du (fem.) ', vgl. Bittner, II, § 19.

(7) *se* ' sie ' 3. Pers. fem. sing., vgl. Bittner, II, § 19. Das *h* soll sicher das *e* ausdrücken wie in der türkischen Orthographie.

EWALD WAGNER

NEW PAHLAVI INSCRIPTIONS ON SILVER VESSELS

Under the title ' Argenterie d'un seigneur sassanide ' Dr. Ghirshman describes, in *Ars Orientalis*, II, 1957, 77–82, a recent find, made in Mazendaran,[4] of silver-ware, the most important constituent of which is a set of three richly ornamented bowls with Pahlavi inscriptions. Of these inscriptions, throughout in *pointillé*, only feeble traces can be seen in the photographs that accompany the article ; for the purpose of reading we depend wholly on a drawing (p. 81). Drawings are useful enough when they supplement photographs ; but no student of epigraphy likes being compelled to rely on another man's eyes. In view of their importance for the history of Oriental art, these inscriptions deserved better ; for they supply, for the first time, a definite date for specimens of ' Sassanian ' silver-ware.

As most Pahlavi inscriptions on objects made of silver,[5] the newly discovered ones consist of two parts, (1) the owner's name followed by *NPŠH* ' own ' (= ' belongs to N.N.'), and (2) a determination of the weight, usually in the form *MN* (number) *ZWZN* ' (made) from so many drachms ' or *MN* (number)

[1] In der Handschrift steht das erste Mal *ṯirít* statt *ṯirít*, was offensichtlich ein Fehler ist. An der zweiten Stelle sind die diakritischen Punkte richtig gesetzt.

[2] David Heinrich Müller, *Die Mehri- und Soqoṭri-Sprache*. III. *Ṣhauri-Texte* (Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften. Südarabische Expedition, Bd. VII), Wien, 1907, 28.

[3] Vgl. Ewald Wagner, *Syntax der Mehri-Sprache unter Berücksichtigung auch der anderen neusüdarabischen Sprachen* (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Institut für Orientforschung. Veröffentlichung Nr. 13), Berlin, 1953, § 157.

[4] The precise locality is not indicated.

[5] For a brief survey of relevant material see my ' Mitteliranisch ' (= *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, IV, *Iranistik*, Pt. 1, 20–130), 49 sq.

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

ZWZN-sng [1] '(made) from so many drachms-by-weight'. Bowls 1 and 2 belonged to the same person; his name is:

wnd't-'whrmzd (Z)Y k'ln'n [2]
(*Windād-ōhrmizd ī Kārenān*).

Windād-ōhrmizd (*Windād-hormizd*) is a very rare name indeed.[3] In the whole history of Iran but a single bearer of it is known, and he flourished in the part of the country where the bowls were found: *Windād-hormizd*, the Ispahbad, who expelled the Arab invaders from Tabaristān and restored the ancient religion.[4] He was, according to the family legend, a lineal descendant of *Kāren* (the son of *Sōχrā*), who was said to have received a part of Tabaristān in fief from Khosrau I; after its supposed founder, the little dynasty was called *Kāren-wand*. As the owner is described as *Kārenān*, i.e. '*descendant of Kāren*',[5] in our inscriptions, we may confidently assert that bowls 1 and 2 once were the property of Windād-hormizd, the famous prince of Tabaristān whose exploits filled the closing years of the eighth century.

On the third bowl, which is smaller and less elaborately decorated, the owner's name is:

'člmyk (Z)Y š(t)lwyn'n [6]
(*Āzarmīg ī Ša(h)rwēnān*).

No such person is known to history: his father's (or perhaps ancestor's) name, *Šarwēn*, is known all the better; that *štlwyn-* [7] is a historic (or inverse) spelling of *Šarwēn-* need not be doubted. We may assume that Āzarmīg was an otherwise unmentioned son [8] of the Malik al-J̌ibāl Šarwēn, Windād-hormizd's friend and supporter.

One cannot take it for granted that the man named in an ownership inscription is the first owner, the person for whom the object was made; but, failing argument to the contrary, there is a presumption in favour of that supposition. In the present instance, moreover, the standard of weight derivable from the

[1] Instead of *sang* 'weight', Ghirshman reads *snī*, a reading that he proposed in *BSOAS*, XIII, 4, 1951, 916 sqq.; cf. 'Mitteliranisch', 49, n. 3.

[2] *k'l-* is clear in No. 1, *-'ln'n* in No. 2, where the first letter is confused and, at any rate in the drawing, joined to the preceding *(Z)Y*; the resulting jumble of traces has been taken for *h* by Ghirshman (such an *h*, however, as would be incommensurate to the rest of the script). This misunderstanding helps to account for his reading of the name: *Zaraspān hormizd hazarnēšač*, which courtesy forbids discussing in detail.

[3] It occurs in the list of witnesses in the Quilon copperplate inscription, 'Mitteliranisch', 51.

[4] See M. Minovi's delightful essay on Māziyār, 4–13 (in M. Minovi and Ṣādiq Hidāyat, *Māziyār*, Tehran, 1312); cf. Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, 134.

[5] Ordinarily the form in *-ān* designates a man's father, sometimes perhaps his forefather. It is possible that Windād-hormizd's father's name was in fact *Kāren*, and not (as stated in most sources) *Farruxān* (which name may have been attributed to him in an attempt to link Windād-hormizd with the earlier Ispahbads).

[6] The *-t-*, to judge by the drawing, is not perfectly executed and thus resembles *-p-* (cf. the *-t* of *wnd't* No. 2); but *šplwyn-* is less likely, though not impossible. According to Ghirshman this name reads *Hormizdē hazarnēšač*.

[7] Or possibly *šplwyn-*.

[8] And presumably, in comparison with Windād-hormizd, a less important and wealthy man, who had to be content with a more modest bowl,

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

second halves of the inscriptions proves that the bowls were not fashioned before the eighth century; Dr. Ghirshman, who uses the figures in order to deduce from them the silversmiths' income, has missed their significance. Bowl No. 1 was made ' from 306 drachms-by-weight ' and weighs 880 grammes; bowl No. 2 was made ' from 274 drachms-by-weight ' and weighs 795 grm. These figures are almost proportionals; strictly, e.g., 880 : 306 = 795 : 276·4. The ' drachm-by-weight ', accordingly, is $\frac{880}{306} = 2{\cdot}876$ grm. and $\frac{795}{274} = 2{\cdot}901$ grm., say approximately 2·9 grm.; the figure has to be increased by a trifle in order to take account of accidental loss.[1] The resulting weight obviously agrees with the early Muslim weight standard (*dirham* = 2·97 grm.), which was introduced by the Omayyad Caliph 'Abd al-Malik in about A.H. 75–6 (= A.D. 694–6)[2]; at any rate it corresponds with no Sassanian measure.[3] Strictly, we should not take a coin weight, such as the *dirham* of 2·97 grm.,[4] as point of departure; for the inscriptions speak[5] of *dra(h)m-sang* (= Pers. *diramsang* = Arab. *dirham al-kail*) ' drachms-by-weight ', which often differed; yet even if we take as basis the weight given by Hinz[6] for the *mithqāl* as used in Iran in early Muslim times, 4·3 grm., the corresponding figure for the *dirham al-kail* will not differ significantly: 2·87 grm. (= $\frac{2}{3}$) or 3·01 grm. (= $\frac{7}{10}$).

In conclusion, it should not be left unmentioned that E. Herzfeld once proposed reading the name of *Šarwēn* (the *Masmoγān* of Demāwend) on such a silver bowl; even though his reading has proved unacceptable,[7] his estimate of the period to which the object belonged has now gained support.

W. B. HENNING

THE NAMES OF GOD IN NORTHERN SOMALI[8]

In Somaliland God is universally known by the names *Allaah*[9] and *Rabbi*, both of Arabic origin, but the full list of His 99 Arabic names is known

[1] We cannot rely here on bowl No. 3, because its inscription is not wholly clear in the drawing. Probably: *MN ccii ZWZN M-iii (Z)Y PW(N) sng* ' (made) from 202 drachms (and) 3 *dāngs* in weight ' (i.e. 202½ drachms). The bowl weighs 544 grm., hence a drachm 544 : 202·5 = 2·686 grm. This is rather too little; a correct proportion would be 880 : 306 = 582·3 : 202·5. However, we may be justified in assuming considerable loss (about 1 in 14) through wear, cf. Ghirshman p. 82 ' son état prouve une grande usure '.

[2] cf. J. Walker, *Arab-Sassanian coins*, cxlvii.

[3] The Sassanian drachm weighed about a whole gramme more.

[4] Or rather 2·96, if the 18 *mithqāl* weight mentioned by Hinz (see below), p. 2, is accurate; for $\frac{7}{180}$ of 76·23 is 2·9645 (and even of 76·235 merely 2·9647). From the average, 4·231 grm., of smaller glass weights (Hinz, p. 1) one also obtains 2·96.

[5] And thus have answered in advance Dr. Ghirshman's question ' les chiffres qui se rapportent aux drachmes, indiquent-ils le poids des objets ou leur valeur ? ' (p. 82).

[6] *Islamische Masse und Gewichte*, p. 6.

[7] ' Mitteliranisch ', 49 sq. Cf. A. Alföldi, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XI, 1957, 239.

[8] There are slight dialectal differences in the Somali spoken by the ' Iise (Esa), Gadabuursi (both Dir), the Isḥaaq, Daarood, and northern Hawiye, but these differences are slight in comparison with those between ' Northern Somali ', spoken by these groups as a whole, and ' Southern Somali ', spoken by the Rahanwiin and Digil, people of the Banaadir Coast, and southern Hawiye. Cf. M. M. Moreno, *Il somalo della Somalia*, Roma, 1955, 3–22; B. W. Andrzejewski and M. H. I. Galaal, *Hikmad Soomaali*, O.U.P., 1956, p. 1.

[9] *Illaah*, and *Illaahi*, also occur in Somali.

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

only to sheikhs and *wadaads*.[1] In addition to the Arabic names, however, there are a considerable number of purely Somali titles for *Allaah*. The majority of those recorded here will be seen to be praise-names referring to God's attributes and in many cases direct equivalents in Somali of the corresponding titles in Arabic. The following list compiled initially by Yuusuf Maygaag,[2] for some time my assistant, and a recognized authority on Somali, does not pretend to be exhaustive.

1. *Baahilaawe* ' He who is without need or want ', Who is self-sufficient ; from *baahi-da* ' need ' or ' want ', and *laawe* ' without '. Cf. Ar. *Al-Ghaniyy*.[3] There is a well-known Somali spirit-possession dance known as *baahilaawe* or *baloolay* (also *baar 'adde*),[4] which seems to have arisen from a particular cult or *dhikri*, but hardly a new *ṭariiqa*, founded perhaps some 200 years ago by a man of the Ogaadeen Reer 'Abdille [5] lineage. But *Baahilaawe* as a name for God may well have existed long before its use in this particular form of praise.
2. *Bogsiiye* ' the Curer, the Healer ' ; from *bogsii* (v.) ' cure, make better, deliver from misfortune '. Cf. Ar. *Al-Shāfī*.
3. *Dile* ' the Killer, He who causes death ' ; from *dil* (v.) ' kill, cause death of '—used of man as agent as well as God. Cf. Ar. *Al-Mumīt*.
4. *Eebbe* ' Master, Lord '. With *Waaq* (see below) the direct Somali correspondence to the Ar. *Allāh*.
5. *Guulle* ' the Victor, He who gives victory ' ; from *guul-sha* ' victory '. Cf. Ar. *Al-Nāṣir*.
6. *Hagaaje* or *Hagaajiye* ' the Amender, the Corrector, He who leads to the right path ' ; from *hagaag-ga* ' the right, the straightened ', *hagaaji* (v.) ' straighten, amend, put right '. Cf. Ar. *Al-Hādī*.
7. *Hanuunshe* ' He who leads to the Right Way ' ; from *hanuun-ka* ' the correct path, the right way ', opposite of astray. Cf. Ar. *Al-Hādī*.
8. *Hidiye* or (in north-west) *Kare* ' the Bestower of Bounties, He who has power to bestow ' ; from *hidis-ka* or *hidin-ta* ' the ability to do or bestow ', and *karti-da* ' power to do '. Cf. Ar. *Al-Qādir*.
9. *Hodmiye* or *Baḍaaḍshe* ' the Enricher, Creator of wealth ' ; from *hodmi* (v.) ' enrich, satisfy ', and *baḍaaḍi* (v.) ' enrich, satisfy '. Cf. Ar. *Al-Mughnī*.

[1] The word *wadaad-ka* is used synonymously with *sheikh*, although strictly the latter is applied to a man whose knowledge of the Sharī'a is more advanced than that of a *wadaad*.

[2] Of the Sa'ad Muuse, 'Abdalla Sa'ad lineage of the Habar Awal clan (Isḥaaq) of the British Protectorate.

[3] In giving the Somali titles for God I do not include the definite article because contrary to the Arabic convention this is not good Somali usage.

[4] *Baloolay-da*, a she-camel which is not pregnant. The dance is said to have acquired this name from its initiator sheikh ' Baahilaawe ' through his having on a certain occasion slaughtered a *baloolay* camel for a party of sheikhs who visited him. It was after this great gesture of hospitality to the *'ulimo* that God gave him wisdom and knowledge of the Sharī'a and inspired him to create the *dhikri* by which he is known as sheikh ' Baloolay ' or ' Bahilaawe '.

[5] The Reer 'Abdille are a large lineage of the Ogaadeen clan of the Daarood clan-family living in the Ogaden region to the south of the British Protectorate. On the Daarood see I. M. Lewis, *Peoples of the Horn of Africa ; Somali, Afar and Saho*, London, 1955, 18–23.

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

10. *Kaalmeeye* or *Gargaare* 'the Helper'; from *kaalmo-ha*, *gargaar-ka*, 'help' or 'assistance'. Cf. Ar. *Al-Mu'īn*.
11. *Koobe* 'the Accounter, the Numberer'; *koob* (v.) 'count, enumerate, know number of'. Cf. Ar. *Al-Muḥṣī*.
12. *Korreeye* or *Sarreeye* 'He who is on high'; from *kor-ka* 'top', *sare* 'on top of'. Cf. Ar. *Al-'aliyy*.
13. *Maḍinte* 'the Everlasting, He who does not die'; from *ḍimo* (v.) 'die', *ma* 'not'. Cf. Ar. *Al-Ḥayy*.
14. *Mahadaale* or *Galladaale* 'He to whom thanks must be given'; from *mahad-da* or *gallad-da* 'thanks'. Cf. Ar. *Al-Shakūr*.
15. *Nooleeye* 'the Creator, the Giver of Life, the Reviver'; from *nolol-sha* 'life'. Cf. Ar. *Al-Muḥī*.
16. *Roone* 'the Generous, the Most Beneficent'; from *roone* (adj.) 'generous, beneficent, strong (in the sense of numerous)', as e.g. *wuu ka roonyahay* 'he is better, greater, stronger, etc.', *ħoogroone*, 'stronger' (as e.g. of two parties). Cf. Ar. *Al-Karīm*.
17. *Sameeye* or *Abuure* 'Maker, Creator'; from *samee* (v.) 'do, make (from something)', *abuur* (v.) 'create (*ex nihilo*)'. *Samee* has the sense of to fashion from already existing material, while *abuur* is to create from nothing and is only applied to God. Thus for example 'I begot (children) but God created (or gave me) them' is in Somali, *anigaa ḍalay Ilaahay baase abuuray*. In this sense the verb *abuur* describes God's precedence in all creative acts or growth, all ultimately spring only from Him. Cf. Ar. *Al-Khāliq*.
18. *Siiye* 'Giver', He who grants; *sii* (v.) 'give'. Cf. Ar. *Al-Wahhāb* and *Al-Mu'ṭī*.
19. *Ururiye* or *Ururshe* 'the Gatherer', He who summons the dead to account; from *urur* (v.) 'collect' or 'gather', inanimate or animate objects. Cf. Ar. *Al-Jāmi'*.
20. *Waaq* or *Waaqa* 'God' cf. *Eebbe* corresponding exactly to Ar. *Allāh*. This word is further discussed below.
21. *Waare* or *Jire* 'the Eternal', He who lives for ever; from *waar* (v.) 'to be eternal', applied only to God, and *jir* (v.) 'be', or 'live', applied equally to persons and things and only in a special sense to God. Cf. Ar. *Al-Bāqī*.
22. *Weyne* 'the Great, Immense'; from *weyn* 'big' or 'large', etc. Cf. Ar. *Al-Kabīr* and *Al-'aẓīm*.

With the exception of *Eebbe* these names are rarely used although they sometimes occur in proper and place names, in swearing, in poetry and songs, and in certain religious expressions. They are particularly used by sheikhs and *wadaads* in interpreting in Somali the various properties and qualities of *Allaah*. In their etymology they reflect the Somali interpretation of Muslim theosophy. It seems impossible to know definitely whether or not they were

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

applied to God in pre-Islamic times, likely though this appears in some if not all cases. But they are certainly generally regarded as being very old.

The name *Waaq* (cf. Galla *Waaqa*)[1] is especially interesting. Cerulli[2] has indicated something of the probable nature of the pre-Islamic cult of the Cushitic God *Waaq*[3] and I have attempted[4] to discuss Somali Sufism in terms of syncretism to it. To-day northern Somaliland is solidly and deeply Muslim and while, as in all countries, there still survive various practices and superstitions regarded by Somali as pre-Islamic,[5] *Waaq* is no longer venerated. I have never heard *Allaah* addressed directly as *Waaq* although He is sometimes addressed as *Eebbe*. The name *Waaq* survives, however, and is regarded by Somali as an ancient pre-Islamic name for God. Its use by the non-Muslim Galla is well-known to Somali but is not considered by them to have been introduced from the Galla. As well as being an old name for God in Northern Somali, the name occurs also in several compound words. Cerulli[6] has instanced its occurrence in proper names such as : *Waaqsuge* (or *Waassuge*, equivalent to *Allaahsuge*) ' he who waits for God ', *Dardaar Waaq* ' adherent of God ',[7] *Ga'alWaaq* ' God's love '.[8] Other clan names which include *Waaq* are : *JidWaaq* ' the path of God ',[9] *TagaalWaaq* ' follower of God ',[10] *'AabudWaaq* ' he who worships God '.[11]

Other more interesting uses are in phrases like *weligaa iyo Waaqaa* (exactly equivalent to *weligaa iyo Allaahaa*) meaning ' never before, never in your life ', as in the sentence, *weligay iyo Waaqay kaas oo kale maan arag* ' I have

[1] See G. W. B. Huntingford, *The Galla of Ethiopia.—The kingdoms of Kafa and Janjero*, London, 1955, 74–87.

[2] E. Cerulli, *RSO*, x, 1923, 1–36.

[3] I do not wish to imply that *Waaq* is the only name for the Cushitic God, or indeed the only Cushitic God, but that this word is one of the Cushitic names for God as e.g. in Galla and Somali.

[4] I. M. Lewis, *BSOAS*, xvii, 3, 1955, 581–602 ; xviii, 1, 1956, 145–60.

[5] I refer here only to ritual, magical, and religious phenomena. The interaction of the Sharī'a and secular Somali custom is a vast and complex subject. Various practices regarded as superstitious, and by some as unorthodox, have also been introduced with Islam from Arabia. Fortune-telling by the beads of the rosary and other means, in Somali *faal-ka*, is of Arabian origin (cf. Ar. *fa'l*). Contrast Somali sorcery, *fal-ka*, corresponding to the Ar. *siḥr*. Arabic works of astrology, medicine, and magic such as *Kitāb al-Raḥma*, by Jelāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Suyūṭī, Cairo, 1938, are very popular in Somaliland and much of the terminology of such practices is Arabic.

[6] Cerulli, op. cit., 5.

[7] In Northern Somali, *dardaaran-ka* is the last will or testamentary disposition of property made orally by a man in the presence of kinsmen and *wadaads* who are charged to see that its terms are fulfilled. *Dardaar* is applied (as an adjective) as a name for the last child of a family of children begotten of the same parents ; it has the sense of ' the last of God's blessing '.

[8] From *ga'al-ka* ' love '.

[9] From *jid-ka* ' road, path, way '. The *JidWaaq* are a Daarood clan living mainly as cultivators to the east of Harar in Ethiopia, whither they were driven from their original home in north-eastern Somaliland probably in the sixteenth century ; see Lewis, *Peoples of the Horn*, 21.

[10] From the verb *tag* ' go '. The *TagaalWaaq* are a Daarood clan living to-day in the western Ogaden between Jigjiga and Harar. Some are found also with the Habar Awal (Isḥaaq) with whom they pay blood-money (*mag-ta*), in the British Protectorate.

[11] From *'aabud-ka* ' fearer, worshipper ', cf. Ar. *'ābid*. The *'AabudWaaq* are a Daarood clan to-day inhabiting the Northern Frontier Province of Kenya to the north-east of the Tana River. For the movement of the Daarood into this region see Lewis, op. cit., 47–8.

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

never seen anything like that in all my life ', or *Waaqay maan arag* ' I have never seen before '. One may also say, *Waaq annu soo noqonnin* (exactly equivalent to *Illaahow aanu soo noqonnin*) ' May he never return ', ' Let God not bring him back '. The name *Waaq* also occurs in the following mat-weaving song, sung both in the east and west of northern Somaliland by women as they make *'aws* or *harrar* [1] mats. This is a ' *Hoyal* ' song (*hees-ta*) named after the character of the refrain in which ' *hoyal* ' is repeated and is worth quoting here in its entirety.

'Awskanow sabool [2] *diidow,*
Waaq an suuqa lagu ḍigin oon,
Soddon lagugu baayi'in [3] *oon,*
Yaa sameeyay lagu uḍanney,
Ey hooyalaayow, hoyal,
Ey hooyalow hooyee,
Hoyalley. [4]

This mat is not for a poor man,
God forbid that I should have to take it to the market,
Thirty (Rupees) could not buy it,
' Who made it ? ' they will ask.
Ey hooyalaayow . . . (equivalent to ' La, la, la . . .').

The Somali expression for abundance and plenty, the time after the rains of abundant water and grass when none go without, is *barwaaqo-da*, as opposed to drought and famine (*abaar-ta*). This word is regarded as being very old and appears to be a compound of *bar-ta* ' a spot of rain ' [5] or ' property ',[6] and *Waaqa* ' God '. This is certainly the only satisfactory etymology which I have been offered by Somali.[7] Although they tell us little of its nature, such usages provide evidence of a former cult of the Cushitic God *Waaq* in northern Somaliland. But in this region it is not under this name that God is now worshipped.

In central and southern Somalia in the area occupied by the Hawiye [8] clan-family, the impression is gained that Islam although strongly developed,

[1] *'Aws-ka* is grass in general, including many separate named varieties and also with *harrar-ka* the general name for those mats woven principally from grass and used in the construction of the walls and roof of the nomadic Somali house. These naturally differ in design and quality.

[2] *Sabool-ka* ' poor, destitute ', perhaps connected with *sabo-da*, a patch of parched grass exhausted by over-grazing near a well where stock water.

[3] Verb from *baaya'ad-da* ' bargaining ' or ' selling ', cf. Ar. *bay'*.

[4] ' *Hoyal* ' is the leading word of the refrain sung at the end of each line by the companions of the soloist. The last three lines are the chorus. The song is transcribed here as it would be sung, and was originally recorded amongst the Ḍulbahante (Daarood) in the east of the British Protectorate. But it is well known generally in the Protectorate.

[5] Large spots of rain are *barweyn*, small spots *baryar*. *Bar* (pl. *baro-ha*) means also any small spot in general, as e.g. a mark on the skin.

[6] *Bar-ta* (pl. *bar-ta*) ' property ' in general, including immovable and movable property and livestock ; cf. *barlaawe* ' without property, property-less '.

[7] *Barwaaq* ' prosperous, lucky, blessed ', as in *BarWaaq*, a nickname of the founding ancestor of the Ogaadeen clan.

[8] For the Hawiye see Lewis, *Peoples of the Horn*, 28–31.

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

is not perhaps quite as deeply rooted as it is in northern Somaliland.[1] This is also, of course, particularly true of the Bantu riverine peoples of the Shebelle and Juba region,[2] but as they are of non-Somali (and non-Cushitic) origin, survivals of pre-Islamic beliefs amongst them are not relevant to a discussion of pre-Islamic Somali survivals. Nor is consideration of the Digil and Rahanwiin (Sab) [3] clan-families of southern Somalia apposite here, for in their present extremely mixed clan constitution they are of relatively recent formation and contain many Galla (Booraan and other Galla) elements.[4] It is probable, therefore, that any traces amongst the Sab of the cult of *Waaq* would be of recent Galla introduction and throw little or no direct light upon pre-Muslim Somali religion.

Features of Hawiye belief and religious practice, especially of the Abgaal clan (living along the coast and to a considerable extent inland, to the north of Mogadishu), which appear to be connected with a pre-Islamic cult of *Waaq* have been noticed by Cerulli.[5] The most significant is the use of the expression *Waaqda'in*,[6] one of many Hawiye expressions for sacrifice, or offering, to God. Other equivalent words in Hawiye are *durraamo*,[7] *Rabbituug*,[8] *Rabbibari*, and

[1] Islam was, according to the testimony of Arab historians, established on the Somali coast by the ninth/tenth centuries, see Lewis, *Peoples of the Horn*, 140. To what if any considerable extent it had at this date penetrated into the interior is difficult to assess. All the Somali clans and clan-families claim ultimately to be of Arabian origin although the extent to which they stress such claims varies considerably. The cult of the Hawiye eponym as a Ṣūfī saint is certainly less developed than that of Sheikh Daarood, who probably reached Somaliland from Arabia in the eleventh century, or of Sheikh Isḥaaq (founder of the Isḥaaq clan-family) whose date of arrival from Arabia is ascribed to the thirteenth century. According to Shariif 'Aydaruus Shariif 'Ali's *Bughyat al-amaal fii taariikh as-Soomaal*, Mogadishu, 1955, 279–81, the eponym 'Samaale' himself emigrated from the Yemen to Somaliland in the ninth century. At any rate, as the Daarood and Isḥaaq clans expanded after the eleventh and thirteenth centuries, the Hawiye, and other Somali, were driven southwards in the direction of their present habitat, and, if the traditions of their Arabian origin are correct, must have originally been Muslim. Their contact with Arabia and Islam may thereafter have decreased in their subsequent migrations. To-day in dress, hair-styles, and other habits, they still adhere as a whole more closely to traditional Somali custom than do either the Daarood or Isḥaaq.

[2] See Lewis, op. cit., 41–3.

[3] The Somali people are primarily segmented into two vast genealogical groups—Samaale and Sab. The first comprises the 'Pre-Hawiye', Hawiye, Dir, and Isḥaaq, and by intermarriage Daarood, clan-families. The second division consists of the Digil and Rahanwiin clan-families.

[4] See M. Colucci, *Principi di diritto consuetudinario della Somalia italiana meridionale*, Firenze, 1924, 119–39. For a summary history of the Sab, see Lewis, op. cit., 46–8, etc.

[5] Cerulli, op. cit., 6–9.

[6] From *Waaq* and *du'ayn* (v.) 'to bless, pray for'; the noun is *du'o-dda*. Cf. Ar. *du'ā'*. Cerulli, op. cit., gives the form *Waaqda'il*, and not *Waaqda'in*, as I have heard it. M. M. Moreno, op. cit., 224, records *Waaqda'in* from an Ashraaf informant of the Reer Hamar clan of Mogadishu town, in Somalia.

[7] *Durraamo* (v.) 'beseech, beg repeatedly, implore', as *waan ku durraamaneyaa* 'I implore you'. The noun is *durraamusho-da* 'beseeching, prayer'. Cf. the proverbial phrase, *Shaydaan naftiisaa janno loo durraantaa* 'The devil is implored to enter Heaven' (but he always refuses).

[8] From *Rabbi* 'God' and *tuug* (v.) 'ask for, pray'. The difference between this word and *tuug-ga* 'thief' is that the vowel sound in the second is pronounced with 'fronting'. According to Andrzejewski's orthography the two words would be written *tu̱ug* and *tu̱ug* respectively. See B. W. Andrzejewski, *BSOAS*, XVII, 3, 1955, 567–80.

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

Allaahbari. The two last mean literally 'to beseech God' (from *bari* (v.) 'beseech, beg') and are applied universally in Somaliland to any type of sacrifice or offering to God. In northern Somaliland, the Hawiye *Waaqda'in* is unknown, and indeed unintelligible, to the majority. Further research amongst the Hawiye (or the Dir),[1] especially amongst those Hawiye living relatively sheltered from external influence along the Ethiopian border of Somalia or in the Northern Frontier Province of Kenya, may reveal more definite traces of the cult of *Waaq* surviving from pre-Islamic times.

I. M. LEWIS

ZUARA BERBER PERSONALS

In his interesting study (*BSOAS*, xv, 2, 1953, 375–90) of Zuara Berber particle-noun complexes, T. F. Mitchell lists (376) the 'exponents of ten categories': nətta y-, nəttat t-, ʃəkk t-əd, ʃəmm t-əd, nətʃ -əɣ; nətnin -ən, nətninat -nət, nəknim t-əm, nəknimat t-mət, nəʃnin n-. It was not his purpose there to dwell on the internal analysis of these forms, but a conventional morphemic analysis offers an instance of interesting organization.

Each of the above exponents will be regarded as a complex of two entities: a personal pronoun and a personal affix. The analysis of the pronouns will be stated first.

The second person singular particle {ʃə-} stands apart from the following form-class; it combines with the two gender suffix morphemes {-kk} and {-mm}, and does not undergo any of the suffix combinations discussed below.

The personal pronoun base (P) is {nə-}, with but one allomorph. The suffixes of p(erson) may then be extracted: {-t-} '3rd', {-k-} '2nd', {-(t)ʃ(-)} '1st'. It is convenient next to state the suffixes of n(umber). The morpheme 'plural' is {-nin ∞ -nim}, with two morphemically conditioned allomorphs, the latter occurring after '2nd'. The morpheme 'singular' is {-ta ∞ -∅}; it is most economical to extract a zero-allomorph as occurring after '1st' so that we may state that an n-suffix always occurs. There is but one suffix of g(ender): {-(a)t} 'feminine'; morphophonemic √(a)/ represents /a/ when not preceded by /a/. The g-suffix is non-obligatory with all suffixes, and non-occurring with '1st'.

The morphemic structure of the personal pronoun is, then, Ppn(g).

[1] The strongest and largest present-day representatives of the Dir clan-family are the 'Iise and Gadabuursi of northern Somaliland, who have, for the most part, lost their traditions of Dir origin. The Isḥaaq, who are considered by other Somali to be Dir, claim themselves to be *ashrāf*, see Lewis, *The Somali lineage system and the total genealogy* (duplicated), Hargeisa, 1957, where these rival claims are discussed in their social contexts. Other small groups of Dir origin survive all over Somaliland and especially in southern Somalia. The Dir are generally regarded as the oldest Somali group.

The 'Iise and Gadabuursi, devout Muslims though they are, are probably the least deeply Islamized of the northern Somali and certainly many pre-Islamic Somali customs survive amongst them in greater clarity than they do amongst the Isḥaaq or Daarood. But while working amongst them I could find no traces of any cult of *Waaq*. More thorough and extended research into their religious practice might, although I doubt it, yield traces of religious beliefs connected with *Waaq*.

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

The personal affixes of the verb (V) offer a different segmentation. It should be noted preliminarily that a morphophonemic $\sqrt{ə}$/ occurs such that throughout these affixes /ə/ appears automatically before final /-C/; it would be necessary to know more about the language in order to state whether $\sqrt{ə}$/ is morphemically automatic or phonemically automatic. Aside from the points which will emerge in the statement which follows, this set, or system, of affixes differs from the pronoun set in being applicable to all numbers of all persons; this justifies treating the pronouns separately from the verbal affixes, and enables us to proceed to set up a fresh set of morphemes without seeking more involute complementations with the allomorphs already extracted and assigned above.

It is convenient to begin with the affixes of p(erson). The morpheme '3rd' is {y- ∞ ⦰ -}, the zero-allomorph occurring when another affix is present; it will be seen that the behaviour of $\sqrt{N}$/ below can be specified simply only by the assumption of a zero-allomorph here. The morpheme '1st' is {-ɣ ∞ - ⦰ }, the zero-allomorph occurring with the plural; this zero-allomorph differs from the last in that it does not condition the allomorphic shape of any other morpheme, but permits us by its presence to state that a p-affix always occurs. The morpheme '2nd' is {t-}.

We proceed to the affixes of n(umber). The morpheme '2nd sg.' (the only occurring morphemic mark of singularity) is {-d}. The morpheme '2nd pl.' is {-m}. The morpheme 'non-2nd pl.' is the ambifix {N}; the morphophoneme $\sqrt{N}$/ has the special sequence property of being phonemically prefixed /n-/ when no other prefix is present, and of being suffixed /-n/ in other environments.

The affix of g(ender) is the ambifix {T} 'feminine'. The morphophoneme $\sqrt{T}$/ is realized as a second-order prefix /t-/ when no plural affix is present; in the 2nd sg. we may regard it as morphophonemically collapsing with '2nd' /t-/, or else we may simply state that {T} does not apply to this form. In other environments $\sqrt{T}$/ is realized as a second-order suffix /-t/. The g-affix does not occur with the affix '1st'.

The morphemic structure of the personal affix is, then, Vp(n)(g).

A few closing comments are in order on the morphemic organization of these forms. Note that a prefixed /n-/ structures not with /t-/, but with /(ə)-d/; and that suffixed /(ə)-ɣ/ structures not with /(ə)-d/, but with /t-/. In this fashion, we see the crucial importance, if we are ultimately to account in an exhaustive and organized way for the total system and its sub-systems, of keeping a clear distinction, in both analysis and statement, of phonemic and morphophonemic properties.

Note the close tie-in of the formal organization with the semantics. Thus, though the seriation appears superficially to be in disorder, the structural order is close-knit and highly congruent with the meaning—though, of course, there is never total congruence between form and meaning, or else they would be but one system, and therefore not discriminable. Note, too, that despite seriation g is an outer-layer affix in both form-classes.

ERIC P. HAMP

This content downloaded from 129.59.95.115 on Mon, 18 Jul 2016 17:46:07 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms